DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 319 CE 027 996

AUTHOR Mayer, Kenneth R.; Clinkscale, Bella G.
TITLE Synthesis of Word Origination Research and Application for Business Communication Curricula.
INSTITUTION Cleveland State Univ., Ohio. James J. Nance Coll. of Business Administration.
PUB DATE [80]
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Business Communication; Business Correspondence; *Business Education; *Business Skills; Communication Research; Communication Skills; Competency Based Education; Educational Objectives; *Educational Research; Higher Education; Minimum Competencies; Research Needs; Verbal Communication; Vocabulary
IDENTIFIERS *Dictation; Transcription Method; *Word Processing

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the question of how dictators interface with word processing personnel and what procedures to use to create the input that is transcribed into the finished business document. The first of three major sections in the review reports the status of word processing technology. It is noted that the 1978 word processing market level was $1.5 billion and 120,000 units, a 33 percent increase over 1977. Section 2 is a review of word origination research and it reports that few word origination studies have addressed the importance of dictation skills and the formal training related to these skills. The studies reviewed are divided into four categories: word origination usage patterns, correspondence costs, dictation training, and dictation competencies. The final section of the paper contains suggested techniques for implementing dictation training in business communication curricula. Included are (1) create a favorable attitude toward dictation and word processing, (2) develop the thought process for dictation, (3) teach specific rules for the actual dictation, (4) develop skill in use of equipment, (5) teach how to evaluate the end product, (6) be as intensive as possible in consideration of time and equipment available, and (7) integrate dictation training into business communication curricula consistent with course objectives. A list of dictation competencies is appended. (LRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED198319

Synthesis of Word Origination Research and Application for Business Communication Curricula

by

Kenneth R. Mayer
Bella G. Clinkscale
Cleveland State University

CE027996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bella G. Clinkscale

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Synthesis of Word Origination Research and Application for Business Communication Curricula

Word origination is emerging as an important area in information processing in the modern business office. It is also an important area for business communication curriculum development. However, relatively little research has been conducted on word origination or dictation competencies. Thus, a major question to be answered by business communication instructors is how do dictators interface with word processing personnel and procedures to create the input which is transcribed into the finished business document? Business communication instructors need to answer this question as designers of courses in written and oral business communication because persons providing the input into the word processing system must possess acceptable dictation competencies to realize the potential of the system.

The purposes of this study are to:

1) Report the status of word processing technology.
2) Review and synthesize the related word origination research.
3) Suggest techniques for implementing dictation training in business communication curricula.

STATUS OF WORD PROCESSING IN THE MODERN OFFICE

The number of offices actually using word processing equipment today is difficult to validate, but a recent membership survey of the Administrative Management Society revealed that 47 percent of the 214 respondents already

use word processing systems and an additional 13.8 percent are considering its use.[1]

According to a 1979 survey by the International Word Processing Association with 1,103 persons responding, word processing centers are getting larger. The average center employs 8.1 persons and has an annual turnover rate of 10 percent. When the survey was first taken in 1974, only 46 percent of the survey participants reported having any staff.[2]

The word processing equipment industry is also growing rapidly to satisfy demand. The 1978 word processing market level was $1.5 billion and 120,000 units, a 33 percent increase over 1977. The Martin Simpson report projects that the word processing industry will have an annual compound growth rate of over 30 percent from 1978 to 1983.[3] Because of projected equipment demand, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that by 1980 there would be a total of 710,000 word processing units installed in this country.[4]

Growth is also evident when sales of individual pieces of word processing equipment are examined. Stanford Research Institute indicates that shipments of editing typewriters alone have been growing by 35 percent. By 1981, that figure is expected to grow to over 900,000.[5] Frost and Sullivan, Inc. forecast that by 1984, 87 percent of the office market will be automated by word processing equipment.[6] According to Radactron Corporation, the expansion of the text editing typewriter market will continue on a world-wide basis.[7]

Parallel with the growth of automated output equipment is the demand for mechanical dictation equipment. Dictation units are standard equipment in four out of five companies. A fairly high ratio of these (38 percent) are centralized systems in the word processing center. Desk-top units

form 29 percent of the equipment in use, and portables 33 percent.[8]

REVIEW AND SYNTHESIS OF RELATED LITERATURE

This survey of recent research on word origination and dictation competencies is intended to be a representative review of the most pertinent studies. Several studies related to word origination have been conducted during the 1970's. However, few are concerned directly with the importance of dictation skills and the formal training related to these skills. Studies describing the use and convenience of longhand far outnumber those describing actual use of competencies as a basis for dictation training. The studies have been divided into four categories according to their major emphasis:

1. Word origination usage patterns
2. Correspondence cost
3. Dictation training
4. Dictation competencies

Word Origination Usage Patterns

Archer and White in a survey of 108 college-trained secretaries found that 79 percent of the secretaries transcribed from handwritten copy. These secretaries were asked how much time of their work day they actually spent in the four methods of dictation/transcription: (1) direct dictation, (2) mechanical transcription devices, (3) handwritten copy, and (4) telephone dictation or direct to typewriter dictation.

The data from the study revealed that 49, or 45.5 percent, of the 108 secretaries took no direct dictation at all. Of the remaining 59 secretaries, 38, or 64.4 percent, spent less than 10 percent of their work day transcribing

from direct dictation. If the 49 secretaries who took no direct dictation at all are included, 87, or 80.6 percent, of the secretaries spent less than 10 percent of their work day transcribing from direct dictation.

With regard to transcription from mechanical devices, 81, or 75 percent, of the secretaries spent less than 10 percent of their work day transcribing from mechanical devices. Even more revealing is the fact that 66, or 61.1 percent, of the 108 secretaries never transcribed from mechanical transcription devices at all.

Eighty-five, or 78.7 percent, of the secretaries transcribed from handwritten copy. Of these 84, 44, or 51.7 percent, spent anywhere from 10 percent to over 50 percent of their work day transcribing from handwritten copy. The handwritten copy was distinctly the most used source of transcription for the secretaries involved in the study.[9]

Lewis investigated letter writing in businesses with word processing equipment. Personal handwriting was the most popular word origination method with approximately 46 percent of all letters handwritten before the introduction of word processing. After word processing implementation, direct telephone dictation accounted for 39 percent of letters, but 36 percent of letters still originated in the form of personal handwriting.[10] Longhand is convenient. Writers need no specialized equipment or personnel and can see the document developing before their eyes. However, longhand is a slow and, therefore, expensive word origination mode.

According to a recent survey of 66 word processing supervisors, the following is a correct assessment of the situation. Sixty-two percent indicated that the estimated amount of material which was input to the word processing operation via dictation equipment was 25 percent or less of the total input. Twenty percent indicated that the input percentage was between

26 and 50 percent; 12 percent indicated that the amount was between 61 and 75 percent; and 6 percent indicated that a higher percentage of material was input via dictation.[11]

To determine current usage, buying plans, and user attitudes, Modern Office Procedures mailed questionnaires to 2,000 randomly selected readers. While seven out of ten companies now use dictation equipment, only one in three people who originate typewritten work use it.[12] This data indicates that business correspondents need more formal dictation training to encourage their use of mechanical input devices.

Correspondence Cost

Fugler revealed significant differences between the cost of a one-page, 150-word letter with two carbon copies prepared via different modes of word origination. The cost (labor, material, and equipment) was $2.88 with longhand and $1.22 with dictation to machine.[13]

Luke made comparisons limited to labor cost using 10 words per minute as the average longhand writing speed and 60 words per minute as the average dictation rate. A 105-word letter would thus cost approximately 33 cents to dictate compared to $1.65 to write in longhand for a dictator whose annual salary was $12,000.[14] Word origination in longhand is clearly more expensive than word origination through dictation to a secretary directly or indirectly through a machine or word processing system.

Dictation Training

The effect of training in dictation techniques was noted by Lewis. Business letter writers who received training originated more of their letters by direct telephone dictation than letter writers without this training.[15]

The importance of dictation in today's office was examined by Folsom and Estaville in a survey of 500 executives, secretaries, business education teachers, and business students. Eighty-seven percent of the executive team members had little or no formal training in giving dictation. Moreover, of the secretarial respondents, 73 percent stated they frequently had to retype correspondence because of poor dictation. When most teachers hear the word "dictation," they immediately equate it with someone taking dictation thus placing the emphasis on the recorder rather than the generator of the dictation.[16]

Dictation Competencies

The curriculum materials and literature of business communication and word processing contain numerous lists of dictation objectives, skills, and suggestions but no systematically developed or validated dictation competency list. Therefore, Clinkscale and Mayer in 1980 identified and validated dictation competencies used by the word originator.[17]

Input was obtained from task analyses, office education curricula, journals, and textbooks. From this input, a preliminary competency list was developed using these criteria for dictation competency identification and refinement:

1. The competency list encompassed the entire spectrum of dictation activities as presently perceived by recognized authorities.
2. Each statement was a dictation competency, i.e., an activity performed by office personnel in the process of dictating business correspondence. Statements were written for use in a workplace setting and were broad enough to encompass all relevant subcompetencies.

3. Competency statements were written at the same level of specificity.
4. Competencies were stated at the action or application level, rather than lower levels demanding only the possession and/or comprehension of information.
5. The competency statements were expressed in non-technical terms and were unambiguous, concise, separate, and distinct.

After the master dictation list was constructed, it was submitted to a multi-disciplinary expert jury of executives, office managers, business educators, transcribers, secretaries, and word processors for the purpose of securing content validation. This feedback was used to construct the final 66-item dictation competency list, which is shown in Table 1.

The dictation competency list was set up in questionnaire format. Respondents were asked to rate competency importance using a five-point rating scale: very important, important, undecided, slightly important, and not important. The questionnaire was mailed to selected dictators, instructors of business communication and word processing, and word processors in northeastern Ohio.

Eighty-six usable responses were received--32 dictators (56 percent response), 21 instructors (35 percent), and 33 word processors (58 percent).

The following null hypotheses were tested:

H_1 There is no significant difference between dictators and instructors on the importance of each dictation competency.

H_2 There is no significant difference between instructors and word processors on the importance of each dictation competency.

H_3 There is no significant difference between dictators and word processors on the importance of each dictation competency.

The statistical method used to test these hypotheses was the Chi-Square Test of Independence. The level of significance for rejection of the null hypotheses was set at .05.

When dictators, word processors, and instructors were compared on the importance of each dictation competency, there were thirty significant differences out of the 198 comparisons made as indicated in Table 2. H_1 (differences between dictators and instructors on competency importance) was accepted for 58 items and rejected for 8 items. H_2 (instructors and word processors) was accepted for 49 items and rejected for 17. H_3 (dictators and word processors) was accepted for 61 competencies and rejected for 5.

These conclusions were drawn from the findings:

1. Overall, there was substantial agreement among dictators, instructors, and word processors on the importance of dictation competencies. Respondents tended to rate items very important to important. Few items were rated undecided, slightly important, or not important.

2. Where there were significant differences, instructors disagreed much more frequently with word processors than with dictators. Furthermore, instructors tended to place higher importance levels on dictation competencies than the other two groups.

3. Dictators and word processors tended to show common agreement more often when compared to each other than when compared to instructors.

4. Apparently dictators and word processors have reconciled many of their differences on the importance of dictation competencies because of their complementary work relationship.

5. Instructors more often disagreedwith practitioners on dictation competencies, possibly because teachers are not totally aware of the complexities of the dictator/word processor work relationship on a day-to-day basis. Or, instructors may tend to be idealistic and, therefore, attach higher importance ratings to dictation competencies in order to include as many dictation competencies as possible in business communication curricula.

DICTATION TRAINING IN BUSINESS COMMUNICATION CURRICULA

As seen from research and business experience, dictation is a complex skill. It is not natural or automatic; it must be taught, practiced, and learned. Word processing supervisors generally agree that initial training is one of the most important considerations in achieving good dictation input into a word processing center. Dictation truly is a team sport, for the output of the dictator becomes the input of the word processor. Dictation is thus a critical interface in the business communication process between the more creative planning and thought processes of the dictator and the more mechanical production and editing processes of word processor.

Lewis determined how business executives received their training for dictating to secretaries and machines. Of the 320 respondents, 79 had no training whatsoever. The breakdown of training methods for the remaining 241 was: 148 trained by equipment vendors, 124 trained by their companies; only eight received dictation training in college. Twenty persons had been trained by other sources which presumably included self-training by reading and practice. Fifty-eight executives had received combinations of two or more types of training.[18]

Which is the best dictation training mode? Self-training, to a large extent, uses the trial-and-error method which is inefficient, mistake-prone, and slow. It requires considerable self-motivation and, if successful, often ingrains bad dictation habits and procedures which must be eradicated later. Vendor training when automated dictation and word processing equipment is installed is usually minimal with less-than complete coverage of dictators. It does not provide for training of new employees nor provide periodic refresher education. Furthermore, because of competitive cost-cutting pressures vendors are cutting back on their initial training. Company training by the word processing staff is expensive to the firm but specific to the equipment and procedures unique to their set-up. In-house training is on-going with periodic brush-up education if needed for problem dictators and training for new employees.

Dictation training is an integral part of collegiate business communication, and, therefore, business administration graduates should be expected to have developed dictation skills to the application or acquaintanceship level as part of their business communication coursework. Inclusion of dictation training in these courses is a natural expectation from the perspectives of both the future employer and employee. Folsom and Estaville found that executives thought formal dictation training to be very helpful or extremely helpful.[19] A 1974 study funded by the American Business Communication Association found that graduating seniors felt that more time should be spent in "dictating business messages." A follow-up study of the same respondents after they had taken jobs in business revealed that they believed even more time should be spent on dictation.[20]

Guidelines

Granted that business practice and the literature reveal the need for

implementing dictation training into business communication courses, how can this be done? There are seven points that should be considered by the instructor in developing an effective dictation training component in a business communication course.

1. Create a favorable attitude toward dictation and word processing in general. This is "basic training." Justify the word processing concept from the time, cost, flexibility, and output quality viewpoints. Business communication students are usually young and inexperienced so they will have little built-in resistance to newer word origination techniques which in-house trainers need to face and overcome. Students need to understand cost benefits of originating, transmitting, and producing output in various word origination modes--handwritten, dictation to stenographer, or dictation to machine. Furthermore, students need to develop fundamental word processing concepts: (1) the role of word processing as a subsystem of a larger administrative support or management information system; and (2) the equipment options available and administrative procedures commonly employed in automated word processing systems.

These are crucial concepts in the development of dictators who realize the cooperative "team support" attitude implicit in the linkage role which dictation plays between the dictator/originator and word processor/producer. Good attitude is important because most problems associated with word processing are human factors, not equipment factors. Dictators must be positive, receptive, and willing to do their important share in providing the dictation input.

2. Develop the thought process for dictation. The dictation competencies identified by the authors attest to the part that the planning and preparatory stages play in the quality of the subsequent dictation and final

business document. The creation of effective business documents is difficult even using the handwritten, rough draft word origination mode. However, after students have developed this facility, they should progress to the oral input mode which uses the same thought process but at a more sophisticated level. The business writing instructor should foster the thought process applied to dictation by sequential development from simple to complex. Have students start with simple, routine, transaction-oriented correspondence (direct requests, good-news letters) and gradually progress to longer, more complex, idea-oriented documents (proposals, reports). The skill of preplanning and using mental and written outlines appropriate to the complexity level of the business document is integral to the production of well-expressed, clear and concise business documents.

3. Teach specific rules for the actual dictation. Some illustrative examples taken from the dictation competency list in Table 1 include dictation of opening and closing instructions and content before and after the actual message part of the document; when and how to spell; when and how to indicate punctuation, capitalization, and numbers; making corrections; and the rate, volume, and clarity of the dictator's voice.

4. Develop skill in use of equipment. Provide as much "hands-on" experience with the three basic types of dictation equipment (portable units, desk-top units, and centralized phone-in systems) as possible given equipment availability. Knowing "what the buttons do" is not enough to ensure confident skillful use of input media on the job.

5. Teach how to evaluate the end product, the typed page. Student dictators must have realistic expectations of the skills of the word processor or they will make unrealistic demands on word processing personnel. With the heavy emphasis on equipment and procedures in word processing systems (especi-

ally centralized arrangements), the dictator can easily forget that there is another human being on the other receiving end of his/her dictation. Dictators need to be taught when to accept minor imperfections which do affect content in light of the cost and time involved in redoing. Dictators must know how to edit and indicate changes, especially when complex, idea-oriented content using text-editing equipment is being used.

6. Be as intensive as possible in consideration of time and equipment available. The business communication curricula is crowded. Content priorities must be observed; equipment limitations must be accepted. Given the current level of office automation today and predictions for the near future, instructors must develop an acquaintanceship level of understanding of dictation and word processing and proceed as far toward the development of job-level skills transferable to the actual job environment as possible.

7. Integrate dictation training into business communication curricula consistent with course objectives and sequential development of organization and writing skills. Schools which offer only one business communication course in which both written and oral communications skills are developed have no decision to make about placement of the dictation component. However, for the increasing number of colleges and universities which schedule separate courses in written and oral business communication, this guidance is offered. Dictation is, strictly speaking, an oral skill so inclusion of dictation in the oral course is defensible, assuming that the oral course follows the written course where basic planning, researching, organizational, and writing skills were learned. Other instructors will rightly maintain that dictation is more closely allied with written communication. It is a logical follow-up step to planning and drafting on paper and should, therefore, follow immediately in the written course when students are in the midst

of the planning and compositional aspects of written communication. Perhaps the final deciding factor will merely be which course can best survive the addition of another content area to crowded syllabi.

Procedures

The following procedure is suggested for designing a dictation component in a college-level business communication course.

1. Instruct in word processing concepts, equipment, and procedures using textbooks, discussion, speakers, films, etc.

2. Provide ample opportunities for students to compose responses to case problems and dictate the documents. Instructors can have students use an ordinary cassette tape recorder to simulate dictation equipment. Instructors in schools with an office administration curriculum which trains word processing personnel should investigate a cooperative arrangement which has reciprocal benefits. Business communication students could use different types of actual dictation equipment to record their dictation. Word processing students could use this input for transcription practice using electronic typewriters, text editors, and printers. This provides realistic training using actual dictation input. Copies of the finished business document can be returned to the student dictator to complete the document production cycle realistically. The student sees the finished product with its strengths and flaws that resulted from the initial case analysis and dictation. Thus, dictators and word processors interact simulating document creation in the modern business office.[21]

3. Evaluate the taped dictation. An evaluation form which assesses six areas as shown in Figure 1. The instructor can devise a rating and weighting system as desired to produce a grade. If dictation is being transcribed by

word processing students, an evaluation form like that shown in Figure 2 might be completed which gives feedback from the viewpoint of the person who had transformed the dictation into the finished document.

4. Return tapes, typed documents, and professor (and student word processor, if possible) evaluations to the student dictators for analysis and improvement on the next dictation attempt.

CONCLUSION

The research reported and the implementation suggestions provided will aid instructors in developing dictation competencies in business communication students. Graduates who can apply word processing concepts and have effective dictation skills will be better able to step into today's automated office with less on-the-job training. They will be able to use all their business communication knowledge and skills more efficiently because they are already efficient word originators.

TABLE 1

DICTATION COMPETENCIES

THE DICTATOR SHOULD BE ABLE TO . . .

Prepare for dictation . . .

1. Schedule dictation according to its importance and priority.
2. Establish regular time for dictation.
3. Dictate early in the day.
4. Analyze supplemental information (i.e., mail, relevant files) before dictation.
5. Select appropriate place for dictation (for example, quiet location free of interruptions).

Pre-plan message . . .

Prepare a written outline . . .

6. Determine the purpose of the message.
7. Visualize the reader.
8. Outline points to be covered.
9. Eliminate unnecessary points.
10. Check sequence and move items freely until the order is logical and coherent.
11. Review the outline for possible omissions.

Prepare a mental outline . . .

12. Determine the purpose of the message.
13. Visualize the reader.
14. Outline points to be covered.
15. Eliminate unnecessary points.

Select appropriate language . . .

16. Use simple, conversational words and phrases (contractions, idioms, personal names).
17. Avoid trite expressions.
18. Avoid professional jargon and technical language.
19. Use concrete language.

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Dictate at correct pace . . .

20. Dictate at slow pace.
21. Dictate at moderate pace (i.e., normal speaking rate).
22. Dictate at rapid rate.

Articulate clearly . . .

23. Use voice inflection to indicate commas, periods, question marks.
24. Use voice inflection to highlight important words and passages.
25. Enunciate clearly (plural endings, similar words and sounds, past tenses).
26. Modulate voice so that it is neither too loud or too soft.

Position receiving unit (microphone, telephone, etc.) properly . . .

27. Hold receiving unit 2-3 inches of lips.
28. Speak across face of receiving unit.

Dictate special features of message . . .

29. Dictate paragraphs.
30. Pronounce and spell out unfamiliar or technical words.
31. Pronounce and spell out unusual names and places.
32. Dictate capitalization.
33. Dictate unusual punctuation (dashes, underscoring, quotes).
34. Dictate long or unusual figures.

Dictate message format . . .

35. Dictate inside address.
36. Dictate attention line, salutation, and subject lines, as needed.
37. Dictate the complimentary closing.
38. Dictate the signer's name and title, closing notations, i.e., P.S. and enclosures.

Dictate special instructions . . .

39. Indicate whether rough-draft or final copy.
40. Specify type of document (letter, memo, report, manuscript).
41. Indicate order of transcription.
42. Dictate special mailing instructions.
43. Indicate approximate length of message.

TABLE 1 (Continued)

44. Indicate number of copies.
45. Specify "end of message."
46. Specify "end of dictation."

Supply additional information to facilitate transcription . . .

47. Specify your name, department, location, telephone extension.
48. Dictate fill-ins for printed forms from left to right and top to bottom.
49. Specify number of columns, column headings, and number of entries for simple tabulations.
50. Provide copy for complicated document formats.
51. Provide instructions for typing same message to several addresses.
52. Supply necessary reference materials to transcriber.
53. Instruct transcriber to obtain names and addresses from related correspondence.

Follow through on post-dictation activities . . .

54. Proofread document throughly and return to transcriber with proofreader's marks for correction.
55. Encourage transcriber to edit so he/she can check for completeness and accuracy of dictated reply.
56. Read finished work aloud including punctuation and paragraphing to hear how it "sounds" on paper.
57. Request work be re-done if necessary.

Promote human relations . . .

58. Compliment transcriber for good work.
59. Encourage transcriber to ask questions about unclear items.
60. Accept suggestions for improvement.

Use proper correction procedures . . .

61. Preface corrections or specific instructions with word correction or operator (or name).
62. Correct by back spacing and then rewording the dictation if using dictation machine.
63. Indicate corrections on log (index slips).

Operate dictation equipment properly . . .

64. Start and stop dictation unit to avoid losing first or last part of dictation.
65. Review and follow input unit instructions for use.
66. Maintain a log (index slips) when using dictation machine.

Table 2

Chi-Square Values for Dictators, Instructors, and Word Processors

Comp. No.	Dictators, Instructors		Instructors, Word Processors		Dictators, Word Processors	
	X^2	df*	X^2	df	X^2	df
1	9.127		1.140		6.846	
2	11.294	4	12.678	4	3.689	
3	2.472		1.052		.649	
4	7.194		7.001		.598	
5	4.170		2.893		4.913	
6	2.451		5.190		4.362	
7	2.588		6.664		6.753	
8	6.742		1.531		7.393	
9	2.638		2.384		5.552	
10	6.708		2.343		5.878	
11	2.179		6.803		4.516	
12	9.295		18.767	4	6.181	
13	2.915		9.307		3.301	
14	9.330		2.759		9.269	
15	6.194		1.073		6.303	
16	3.248		4.300		.809	
17	9.754	4	6.961		2.171	
18	3.934		3.344		8.739	
19	8.151		7.638		.576	
20	4.504		3.857		7.364	
21	10.503		6.930		3.610	
22	.620		10.420	4	16.312	4
23	3.970		8.134		7.325	
24	2.260		11.495	3	16.866	2
25	8.258		17.008	5	4.334	
26	4.506		20.077	3	11.726	2
27	2.613		4.895		9.255	
28	4.836		5.869		17.984	5
29	10.470	4	10.989	4	5.256	
30	6.338		13.133	4	7.764	
31	3.775		9.222	3	2.275	
32	12.456	4	8.755		3.318	
33	8.827	3	13.167	3	1.426	
34	2.530		11.550	4	7.223	
35	5.658		5.580		3.090	
36	.886		4.334		3.795	
37	6.399		2.527		7.676	
38	3.164		3.641		6.843	
39	5.089		11.556	4	2.646	
40	2.303		2.218		2.478	

Table 2 (Continued)

Comp. No.	Dictators, Instructors		Instructors, Word Processors		Dictators, Word Processors	
	X^2	df*	X^2	df	X^2	df
41	5.974		.097		6.946	
42	3.439		4.083		4.431	
43	3.420		1.302		2.983	
44	5.076		4.854		4.346	
45	4.452		7.236		5.934	
46	4.280		.983		2.064	
47	3.536		5.318		1.912	
48	3.766		4.798		2.430	
49	2.777		15.067	4	9.232	
50	3.074		4.931		4.414	
51	5.350		3.242		4.071	
52	5.835		2.875		1.385	
53	4.268		6.386		1.300	
54	7.391		12.569	4	7.962	
55	.903		2.201		1.995	
56	1.993		3.000		8.453	
57	6.694		14.483	4	9.087	
58	4.941		9.643	4	7.257	
59	1.093		5.508		1.989	
60	3.982		1.412		3.119	
61	11.552	4	6.734		3.747	
62	2.049		7.026		5.859	
63	21.183	4	7.399		9.731	4
64	4.489		1.403		4.710	
65	1.840		3.156		2.461	
66	25.051	5	11.427	5	6.015	

*Degrees of freedom are reported for X^2 values significant at the .05 level.

Figure 1

DICTATION EVALUATION (INSTRUCTOR)

1. CONTENT (See letter for additional remarks)
   a. Analysis of writing problem . . . . . _____
   b. Organizational pattern . . . . . _____
   c. You-attitude . . . . . _____
   d. Appropriate language . . . . . _____
2. OPENING INSTRUCTIONS . . . . . _____
   Next time, include:
3. CONTENT DICTATION . . . . . _____
   Next time, include:
4. CLOSING INSTRUCTIONS. . . . . _____
   Next time, include:
5. INDICATING INSTRUCTIONS . . . . . _____
6. VOICE
   a. Articulation . . . . . _____
   b. Volume . . . . . _____
   c. Rate . . . . . _____

GRADE

Figure 2

DICTATION EVALUATION (WORD PROCESSOR)

TO:_____ DATE_____

YOUR DICTATION CAN BE TRANSCRIBED AND RETURNED TO YOU MORE QUICKLY NEXT TIME IF YOU WILL HELP ME BY GIVING CAREFUL ATTENTION TO THE ITEMS CHECKED BELOW:

( ) Dictator did not indicate "Rush" priority at start of dictation
( ) Dictator did not identify name, location, phone number
( ) Type of communication (letter, memo, etc.) not identified at the start
( ) Number of carbon copies needed not indicated at the start
( ) Full name, address, zip code not given for letter
( ) Room numbers or locations not given for addresses of memos
( ) Special instructions not clear
( ) No subject dictated for letter, memo
( ) Did not indicate paragraphs, sentences, etc.
( ) Did not spell out technical terms, difficult words, proper names immediately after dictating (Preferred method: B as in boy, D as in dog, V as in victor, etc.)
( ) Enunciation unclear--particularly plurals, possessives, past tense
( ) Dictator did not indicate retention period for draft requests (a day? a week? a month?) at start of dictation
( ) Dictator held receiver too close to lips for best sound recording
( ) Dictator held receiver too far away from lips for adequate sound recording
( ) Extraneous noises--coughing, wrinkling paper, smoking, other room noises interfered with transcribing
( ) Dictated too slowly for most efficient transcription
( ) Dictated too fast for most efficient transcription
( ) Dictator did not clearly instruct the word processor regarding the number, length, etc., of tabulations dictated
( ) Tabulated data and columns were dictated vertically instead from left to right for each line (very helpful if dictator would forward written notes concerning involved dictated tabulations to word processing center)

( ) _____

_____

_____

Thanks for your cooperation,

_____
Word Processor's Name

(Form used and adapted with permission, Patricia McLaughlin, Supervisor Word Processing Center, Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Cleveland, Ohio, 44101)

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. "Dictation Today: Voices of the Users," Modern Office Procedures, March 1979, p. 70.

2. "Survey Finds Centers Get Larger," Word Processing Systems, September 1979, p. 8.

3. "WP Market Growing Faster Than Predicted," Word Processing Systems, March 1979, p. 6.

4. Leonard B. Kruk, "Word Processing and Its Implications for Business Communications Courses," The Journal of Business Communication, Spring 1978, p. 17.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid.

8. "WPS User Survey Measures Tremendous Growth of WP Community," Word Processing Systems, January 1980, p. 24.

9. Ernest Archer and Roberta Dunlap White, "Whatever Happened to the Art of Dictation?" Business Education Forum, 32, October 1977, pp. 17, 19-20.

10. Stephen Dale Lewis, "The Effect of Word Processing on Business Letter Writing," unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of North Dakota, 1977.

11. "WPS User Survey Measures Tremendous Growth of WP Community," Word Processing Systems, January 1980, p. 10.

12. "Dictation Today...," loc. cit.

13. Robert Fugler, "Which Costs Less - The Phone or the Letter?" Management World, 6, April 1977, pp. 13-14.

14. Cheryl M. Luke, "Dictation: An Important Business Communication Skill," Business Education Forum, 33, October 1978, pp. 26-27.

15. Lewis, loc. cit.

16. Laura B. Folsom and Joyce D. Estaville, "Does the Boss Need Training?" Business Exchange, October 1979, pp. 25-26.

17. For an extended treatment of the study, see: Bella G. Clinkscale and Kenneth R. Mayer, "Identification and Validation of Dictation Competencies," The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, Volume 22, April 1980, pp. 15-27.

18. Stephen D. Lewis, "Dictation Training: An Asset for Business Executives," ABCA Bulletin, 33, March 1980, pp. 10-11.

19. Folsom and Estaville, loc. cit.

20. Lewis, op. cit., p. 11.

21. Readers interested in the mechanics of such cooperative ventures should consult: Mona J. Casady, "Word Processors Are Made Not Born," Business Education Forum, 34, January 1980, pp. 14-15; and A. C. Krizan and Patsy Nichols, "Implementing Dictation Into Business Courses," Balance Sheet, 51, March 1980, pp. 267-268.